

PATENT APPLICATION

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 2622**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE **RECEIVED**

In re the Application of

MAR 05 2003

Tokunori KATO et al.

Group Art Unit: 2622 **Technology Center 2600**

Application No.: 09/266,922

Examiner: J. Pokrzywa

Filed: March 12, 1999

Docket No.: 102460

For: COMMUNICATION TERMINAL APPARATUS AND METHOD

#10
KD
3-13-03

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In reply to the October 22, 2002 Office Action, the period for reply being extended by the attached Petition for Extension of Time, reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-24 are pending.

The Request is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the Request: (a) places the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the Request amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); and (c) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the Request is thus respectfully requested.

Page 2 of the Office Action states that the proposed drawing corrections filed on August 1, 2002 have been approved. Accordingly, Applicants attach hereto a Letter to the Official Draftsperson forwarding formal corrected drawings.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hiyokawa et al. (hereinafter "Hiyokawa"), U.S. Patent No. 6,333,702. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hiyokawa fails to disclose a communication terminal apparatus comprising a first memory that stores parameters for each of a plurality of geographical divisions and at least one operation-control program, a second memory, and a control device that initializes the second memory on the basis of parameters for a selected geographical division, the parameters for the selected geographical division being read from the first memory as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited as a method in claim 12. In particular, Applicants submit that in Applicants' claims 1 and 12, when a selected geographical division has been selected, a control device uses the parameters for the selected geographical to initialize the second memory.

Page 3 of the Office Action states that the CPU (2) of Hiyokawa initializes the second memory (flash memory 3) on the basis of parameters for a selected geographical division. However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Hiyokawa, stored navigation processing programs and programs related to other processes executed by the CPU (2) are stored in the data storage medium (37) and are installed (transferred/copied) when: A) the data storage medium (37) is set onto the navigation device; B) when the power source circuit of the navigation device is closed; or C) according to an instruction from the operator (col. 8, lines 9-15). In addition, Fig. 6 of Hiyokawa shows that for an initialization process in Hiyokawa, the program for navigation is read from the data storage medium (37), is copied onto the program region (PL) in the flash memory (3) or in the RAM (4) and is executed (col. 10, lines 37-40). Thus, Applicants submit that nowhere does Hiyokawa disclose that the CPU (2) transfers or copies programs

and/or data to, for example, the flash memory (3) or RAM (4) based on parameters for a selected geographical division.

Thus, Applicants submit that nowhere does Hiyokawa disclose that a control device initializes the second memory on the basis of parameters for a selected geographical division as recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 12.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Hiyokawa fails to disclose communication terminal apparatus comprising a first specification storing device into which a plurality of specifications and at least one operation-control program are pre-stored, a selector device that selects a selected specification from the first specification storing device, a second specification storing device that stores the specification selected by the selector device, a determining device that determines whether the specification stored in the second specification storing device is a predetermined specification, and a control device that performs a control such that a main program starts, if the determining device determines that the specification stored in the second specification storing device is the predetermined specification as recited in claim 7 and as similarly recited as a method in claim 17.

Page 6 of the Office Action states that the determining device (CPU (2)) determines whether the specification stored in the second specification storing device is a predetermined specification (col. 39, line 66 - col. 40, line 19) and the control device (CPU (2)) performs a control such that the main program starts (col. 11, line 12 - col. 12, line 43), if the determining device (CPU (2)) determines that the specification stored in the second specification storing device is a predetermined specification (col. 12, lines 34-58). However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submit that in col. 11, lines 12-26, Hiyokawa discloses that the user specifies the coordinate position on the road map or on the house map shown on the display (33). Similarly, in Hiyokawa, the user can select the destination from a list of destinations

shown on the display (33). Nowhere does Hayakawa disclose determining whether the coordinate position on the road map or house map is a predetermined specification. In addition, in col. 39, line 51 - col. 40, lines 6, Hayakawa simply discloses that the an area corresponding to a determined postal code number is shown on the map. However, Applicants submit that nowhere does it disclose that the CPU, for example, determines whether the zip code is a predetermined specification.

Therefore, Applicants submit that nowhere does Hiyokawa disclose that the CPU determines whether the specification stored in the second specification storing device is a predetermined specification and that the control device performs a control such that the main program starts, if the determining device determines that the specification stored in the second specification storing device is a predetermined specification as recited in claim 7 and similarly recited in claim 17.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Hiyokawa fails to disclose all the features of claims 1, 7, 12 and 17, as well as all the features of claims 2-6 and 21, 8-11 and 22, 13-16 and 23, and 18-20 and 24, which depend from claims 1, 7, 12 and 17, respectively. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 - 24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Letter to the Official Draftsperson

Date: March 5, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Tokunori KATO et al.

Group Art Unit: 2622

Application No.: 09/266,922

Examiner: J. Pokrzywa

Filed: March 12, 1999

Docket No.: 102460

For: COMMUNICATION TERMINAL APPARATUS AND METHOD

#9
3-13-03

LETTER TO THE OFFICIAL DRAFTSPERSON

Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Please substitute the attached 4 sheets of formal drawings depicting Figures 5-7 and 12 for the corresponding drawings filed with the application. The attached drawings have been corrected pursuant to the approved Request for Approval of Drawing Correction filed on August 1, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Date: March 5, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
